In the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh.

Civil Revision No.3800 of 2007.
Date of decision : 2.8.2007.

Ranjita .... Petitioner.

vs

Gagandeep Singh .... Respondent.

Before : Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.S.Madan.

Present: Mr.Gautam Dutt,Advocate,for the petitioner.

*Judgment*

*R.S.Madan, J.(oral)*

This revision is directed against the order dated 5.4.2007 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh, vide which he granted maintenance @ Rs.4000/- per month to the petitioner- wife from the date of filing of the application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act.

It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the respondent-husband is a man of resources and is doing the business of exports, import and property consultant and has been earning more than Rs.1.50 lacs per month. He referred to the admission made by the respondent in the petition filed for custody of child under Sections 7 and 8 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890, wherein the respondent has admitted as under:-

> "*That the petitioner and his father have a good financial background. The petitioner is doing the business of import and exports and earning handsome income for maintaining the minor son Gurjap Singh and the petitioner is also maintaining one car (Honda City) No.PB-10 AT-0275 and two telephones bearing Nos.2410575 and 2406997,*

*besides a Mobile No.98100-90275. The petitioner is the only son in the family and the father of the petitioner owns a palatial house measuring 644 Sq. Yards in the posh locality, Gurdev Nagar, Ludhiana.*

*That the petitioner is ready and willing to maintain the minor child and is in a good position to provide good education and other necessities of daily life."*

According to the learned counsel for the petitioner the learned District Judge, Ludhiana, has not taken into consideration the income of the respondent and has granted inadequte maintenance to the petitioner (wife) at the rate of Rs.4000/- per month. It is further contended that the father of the petitioner is a retired employee and cannot maintain her from his pension. The petitioner has not placed on record any documentary proof in support of income of the respondent from whom she is claiming maintenance. The statement of the husband is not part of the file of trial court otherwise it would have been mentioned in the order. This statement has been filed with this revision for the first time.

After going through the impugned order and keeping in view the arguments addressed by the counsel for the petitioner, I am of the view that this revision petition lacks merit and does not call for any interference by this court, therefore, the same is dismissed, in limine.

2.8.2007. (R.S.Madan)
vs. Judge.